

# FARMINGTON PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS

Monday, April 14, 2008

Chairperson Gronbach called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at the Farmington City Council Chambers, 23600 Liberty Street, Farmington, Michigan.

## **ROLL CALL**

Present: Buck, Christiansen, Gronbach, Ingalls, Kuiken, Pogue, Scott, Sutton.

Absent: Bowman.

A quorum of the commission was present.

**OTHER OFFICIALS PRESENT:** Building Inspector Koncsol, City Manager Pastue, Recording Secretary Schmidt.

## **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MOTION by Kuiken, seconded by Buck, to approve the agenda. Motion carried, all ayes.

## **APPROVAL OF ITEMS ON CONSENT AGENDA**

MOTION by Pogue, seconded by Sutton, to approve the following item on the consent agenda:

- A. Approve Regular Meeting Minutes of March 10, 2008.

Motion carried, all ayes.

## **CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE FAÇADE RENOVATION, KITCHEN MASTER, 32729-33 GRAND RIVER**

City Manager Pastue reviewed the background of the January meeting; wherein the Planning Commission reviewed a proposed façade improvement for the Beyond Building located at 33401 Grand River. He stated the building is in the Central Business District and subject to the Downtown Design Standards. He commented the Commission reviewed the report from LSL Planning at the January meeting and the proponent, Ken Strom, was advised of the items contained in the LSL Report summary. Pastue advised Mr. Strom the Planning Commission did not feel it was necessary to address item #5 in the summary. Pastue noted it is still necessary for the Design Committee to consider waiving the 75% brick requirement for the parking lot elevation and authorize the use of Hardi-Plank as a suitable material substitution to retain the historical character of the building. He commented the Design Committee is scheduled to meet on April 24<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Strom noted in his report that the only façade being renovated is on the building currently being occupied by Beyond and Kitchen Master; no awning will be installed at a height of less than 8 ft. off the ground; "Sunbrella brand" awnings would be used since they hold color longer and are more durable than canvas; and that the entire face of the building on Grand River is brick and the use of "4" exposure Hardi-plank fiber cement siding on other exposed areas to maintain the historical integrity of the building.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Scott, Mr. Strom stated the façade would be redone.

Chairperson Gronbach asked if the proposed site plan extended beyond Kitchen Master and Mr. Strom replied the site would look like two separate buildings when the project is completed, and he reviewed the colors on the plan and the colors to be used on the project.

Mr. Strom stated he wanted to select the awnings first and then make the paint selection to go along with it.

Gronbach suggested that Mr. Strom obtain color samples for the Design Committee since the plan is subject to their approval. Mr. Strom provided samples of siding for the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Ingalls asked if the wall that goes back on the east side of the building was parallel with the building. Mr. Strom explained that portion was an angle and that portion would be Hardi-plank.

Scott verified that the Grand River side of the building would also have awnings.

Gronbach verified the face brick on the front of the building would be cleaned and not painted. Gronbach also verified there would be plantings in the window boxes.

MOTION by Christiansen, seconded by Kuiken, to approve the façade renovation for Kitchen Master, 32729-33 Grand River, as presented, on the plans reviewed by the Commission this evening, subject to review and approval of the Design Committee and that the petitioner provide, as requested, the exterior façade materials to the Design Committee for consideration of their review. Motion carried, all ayes.

**CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE FAÇADE IMPROVEMENT IN CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, EXCHANGE BUILDING, 33314 GRAND RIVER**

Pastue noted the Exchange Building recently housed the DDA office. He stated the applicant would change the south and north elevations. The south elevation would have a second story added to closely match the building line on this block and to recreate the historical look of the building at the street level. He commented a window would be added to the north elevation, a black canvass canopy installed, and other

minor improvements. He stated the proposed improvement will not include a second story addition, but the reconstruction of the interior and the building structure will allow for a second floor to be added at a later date.

Steve Schneemann, proponent for the Exchange Building, was present to review and discuss the proposed façade improvement. He noted they named the building the Exchange Building since it used to be the Exchange Bank. Schneemann stated his client would like to turn the building into a two-story façade, but at this time, not have an actual second story. He noted they would be putting up a two-story façade on the Grand River side, dressing up the façade with new windows on the parking lot side, facing the north; recapture the architectural detail; and will try to capture the brick detailing. Schneemann stated they are trying to keep in order with the Master Plan by developing a multi-story building downtown with the hopes of it being mixed use, at some point in the future. He reviewed the design concept and passed out pictures of the intended look. He described the addition of three windows on the upper level, with retractable black canopy, and the detailing along the cornice line. He noted they want to try and compliment the buildings on either side. Schneemann commented the window trim would be black and they would like to use a full modular brick that would look in character with the building. He noted they want to create an East Coast look to the building.

Mr. Schneemann stated the Design Committee questioned the back of the building and he noted they are proposing to paint everything on the back side of the building a flat black to make it not as noticeable. He stated steel structure would need to be added in the rear and they would be adding two steel supports that would be painted flat black until the second story would be added.

He proposed they would be using a black canopy to cover the mansard roof and will not be making any siding changes other than painting it.

Responding to a question from Pogue, Mr. Schneemann stated the windows would have a reflective glass with a coating.

Commissioner Kuiken asked how the marine grade plywood on the back of the facade would hold up against the weather. Mr. Schneemann responded the plywood material would withstand many years of water hitting it constantly, but it needs to be painted in about 8 years.

Gronbach asked if the second floor could be added on later. Mr. Schneemann responded it could be, but for budgetary purposes they are trying to make a statement with the front façade and will add the second floor at a later time.

Ingalls asked if the plywood could cover, at a slope, the back of the new wall area with a shingle instead of painted plywood. Mr. Schneemann responded the suggestion was a

good one and they would consider it. Ingalls stated it might echo the canopy at the back.

Scott suggested using brown or beige instead of black at the back of the building to pick up the color of the adjacent brick. He also voiced concern with the maintenance issue on the upper story and the color of the glass. Schneemann replied they could install venting to reduce the heat and a medium to darker grey would be used on the glass.

Scott asked if the height of the awning in the back was an issue. Schneemann replied they are trying to match what is there.

Gronbach suggested the proponent make an adjustment to comply with the 8 ft. requirement in the rear. Schneemann stated if there was a problem they could rip the existing roof off. Gronbach suggested that Mr. Schneemann work with Administration regarding the height issue.

Christiansen asked if the streetscape would come into fruition and also noted it was very nice.

MOTION by Christiansen, seconded by Buck, to approve the façade improvement for the Exchange Building at 33314 Grand River, in accordance with the submitted plans. Motion carried, all ayes.

**REVIEW OF PLANNING REPORT, BROWN ACADEMY – MONTESSORI SCHOOL, 23339 ORCHARD LAKE ROAD, AND CONSIDERATION TO SCHEDULE SPECIAL LAND USE PUBLIC HEARING.**

Sherrin S. Hood, AICP Senior Planner, LSL Planning, Inc. stated LSL recommended approval of the special land use request to permit a day care/school use to be located at 23329 Orchard Lake Road, with the following conditions:

1. The Planning Commission may require additional shrubs to be planted in the greenbelt.
2. Any proposed wall signs must be submitted to the City for administrative approval.
3. The applicant shall provide copies of any required licenses and permits from the State or County that apply to this use. Any conditions imposed by these agencies will also become a condition of city approval.

Ms. Hood stated there should be enough supervision of the children on the playground since the potential fencing of the play area is open to the tennis courts. She noted the State might require complete fencing of the play area.

Atman Trivedi, proponent, was present to answer questions from the Commissioners. She stated they were licensed for 20-25 children from the ages of 2 ½ to 6 years of age.

The hours of operation would be from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., and there will be a staff of three people. She noted the playground area is 1,250 sq. ft. and is located at the rear of the site

Christiansen verified that there had been a day care center in this location once before and that an outdoor area had been used for a playground.

Gronbach verified the playground area would be fenced in.

Buck asked how the walkway to the play area would be marked. Ms. Trivedi responded there would be signs stating "Children at Play" and there will be teachers who will walk with the children. Buck asked if they would exit the rear door to the driveway and he noted there was a blind approach for a car coming into the drive. He asked if there was going to be a sign there showing children walking in the area. Ms. Trivedi replied they would have a "Children at Play" sign and would be using orange cones to mark the area. Kuiken suggested several cones be used to mark the area.

Christiansen verified that any conditions imposed by the State or County that applies to this use will also become a condition of city approval.

Scott voiced concern regarding the walkway and asked how many children will go outside at a time. Ms. Trivedi responded there will 20 at a time. Scott suggested a person be located at the north and south sides of the building and that mirrors be positioned for pedestrian safety purposes. He commented he felt there were ADA issues and the area looked tight.

Gronbach stated the walkway situation needed to be addressed and suggested the proponent meet with the owner of the center to deal with the walkway.

MOTION by Pogue, seconded by Ingalls, to schedule a Public Hearing for the Brown Academy – Montessori School, located at 23339 Orchard Lake Road, on May 12, 2008. Motion carried, all ayes.

### **REVIEW OF SITE PLAN AND CONSIDERATION TO SCHEDULE SPECIAL LAND USE PUBLIC HEARING – FUN CITY, 31506 GRAND RIVER.**

Sherrin S. Hood, AICP Senior Planner, LSL Planning, Inc., stated they recommended approval of the special land use request to permit an indoor entertainment and amusement establishment, at 31506 Grand River, provided the Planning Commission feels adequate parking is provided to serve the site. She noted the recommendation is conditioned upon the following:

1. The applicant must provide the final square footage of both tenants in the building, including any storage or warehouse space that may

- be excluded from the parking requirement, so the figures discussed in the report can be verified.
2. The site plan must be revised to reflect the revised parking layout to consider pedestrian access to the southern entrance.
  3. Any proposed wall signs must be submitted to the City for administrative approval.

She noted the more building space occupied is in the favor of the proponent since there is not a set standard for this use regarding parking and she used a municipal recreation center as an example, which was based on occupancy. Ms. Hood commented the applicant stated the occupancy was based on how many restrooms there would be in the building and they were limited to a maximum of 500 occupants and the applicant did not anticipate 500 people being in the building at one time. The applicant advised Ms. Hood they were adding extra restrooms to avoid long line-ups.

Ms. Hood noted the applicant indicated they plan to move a few spaces in front of the entrance to a location farther to the rear of the building, where the overhead doors are located. She commented the overhead doors will not be used on a regular basis and will only be used to deliver and remove equipment from the building, using the area for parking is acceptable.

Gaz Ismail, proponent, stated his business has been in Farmington for the last ten years and they wanted to expand in order to provide bumper cars and miniature golf as another attraction for the birthday parties that are held there. He commented they are not sure what size and space is needed. He commented parents drop their children off at his location and do not use the parking spaces.

Sutton asked the proponent why he was waiting to state the space that is needed and that the Commission had to have this information before scheduling a public hearing. Mr. Ismail replied he would like to have a 10,000 sq. ft. Go Cart track, 3200 sq. ft. Laser Tag, 6000 sq. ft. lobby and an area for miniature golf. He stated he started with 18,500 sq. ft. and the person he is working with suggested a larger sq. footage and the decision from the property owner has not been received. Mr. Ismail stated he would have the exact sq. footage at the next meeting.

Sutton questioned the signage since there are two frontages: one on Mooney and one on Grand River. Mr. Ismail replied he has not had a chance to review the Sign Ordinance and noted there would be a 20 x 20 bay window that would look like a storefront and their frontage would be on Mooney. He discussed his intentions for signage.

Pogue questioned the hours of operation and Mr. Ismail responded the hours would be: Monday – Thursday, 4:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m.; Friday, 3:00 p.m. – 12:00 a.m.; Saturday, 12:00 p.m. – 12:00 a.m. and Sunday close at 9:00 p.m.

Kuiken questioned how many people would be in the location at one time. Mr. Ismail replied they have 6 – 8 birthday party rooms, which hold 20 people and explained that the maximum would be 140 people. He noted they would rotate people to different attractions within the building. He stated he felt there would not be a parking problem. In response to a question by Kuiken, Mr. Ismail stated the busiest time is in the winter and the maximum occupancy would be 200 people.

Ingalls asked if there were go-carts outside and the applicant replied they would be inside.

Gronbach asked the applicant if he would have all of the information needed at the next meeting in order for the Commission to schedule a public hearing. Mr. Ismail replied he would provide the information at the next meeting.

Scott asked Ms. Hood if she had dealt with a situation similar to the site plan presented. Ms. Hood replied she had not, but the ordinance states the Planning Commission has the discretion to approve parking, at what the Commission feels is comfortable for the site based on past history. She noted based on 140 occupants there would need to be 57 parking spaces. She stated she would research the issue and report back to the Commission.

Sutton commented that the occupancy of 200 people did not mean there would be 200 drivers to the facility.

Responding to a question by Ingalls, Mr. Ismail described the usual party situation that involved parents dropping off children and the party usually would last 1 hour and 45 minutes. He reviewed how the party groups attended the various activities.

MOTION by Kuiken, seconded by Ingalls, to approve the scheduling of the Special Land Use Public Hearing for Fun City, located at 31506 Grand River. Motion carried, all ayes.

Gronbach noted the Public Hearing would be held on Monday, May 12, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. and asked the proponent to provide the required information.

**CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE SITE PLAN – COLD STORAGE BUILDING, 32400 NINE MILE ROAD.**

Pastue stated the Planning Commission had approved the revised site plan on March 8, 2004. He advised the previous owner never built the structure that was approved at that meeting and now Dan Wallace owns the property. Pastue noted Mr. Wallace is proposing to construct the addition that Mr. Rice received approval for but never built. Pastue referred to the minutes of the approval in the March 8<sup>th</sup> meeting that was included in the Commissioners' packets.

Pastue commented the front and rear setbacks meet the requirements based on the noted minutes.

He stated Ms. Hood reviewed the parking spaces allowed and determined the appropriate number would be 15 instead of 25.

Dan Wallace, proponent, stated he was proposing a 6,800 sq. ft. addition to an existing cold storage unit at 32400 Nine Mile Road and was continuing with the plan that was approved by the prior owner, Mr. Rice.

Gronbach verified the site plan was the same as presented in 2004.

Gronbach noted Ms. McShane made the motion for approval of the original site plan on March 8, 2004.

Kuiken asked about the landscaping. Building Inspector Koncsol stated it is adjoining industrial property and did not see a specific need for landscaping at this point.

MOTION by Sutton, seconded by Buck, to approve the Site Plan for the Cold Storage building at 32400 Nine Mile Road. Motion carried, all ayes.

### **CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE SITE PLAN – SOAVE PROFESSIONAL OFFICE BUILDING**

Pastue reviewed the report from LSL from the October 10 meeting noting the items that needed to be addressed before placing the site plan on the agenda for approval. He stated the items to be addressed are: variance regarding dumpster enclosure, tree inventory, width of handicap parking space, photometric plan, the MDEQ Wetlands Permit and MDOT curb cut approval. Pastue noted the variance request was granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting of March 5<sup>th</sup>; the applicant submitted a tree inventory found on Sheet LP-2; handicap parking space on the revised site plan show the handicap space at 16'; site plan still shows the bollard pole lighting on the east side of the parking lot; the MDEQ permit was received; but City Administration has not received any information that the MDOT curb cut has been approved.

John Nagy, Community Planner for Soave Professional Office Building, reviewed the tree survey and noted a Red Maple was tagged as a landmark tree and will replace that tree with requirements by the Planning Commission. He noted the placement of six Canadian Hemlock trees.

He stated they met with the Board of Zoning Appeals and a variance was granted regarding not having a trash enclosure. He noted they will be using a trash compactor located in the basement of the building and the compacted trash would be taken off site and not placed at the curb for pickup.

Mr. Nagy understood the Commission wanted a 12 ft. pole for lighting at the end of the retaining wall and will match the pole on the west side of the lot in front. He stated they show 4-bollard lighting along that wall and they understood the Commission wanted lower bollard lighting, but noted they could go either way. He noted the 2-12 ft. poles at the end of the wall and the bollard lighting.

Gronbach noted he came up with 7 or 8 trees instead of the 1 listed by Mr. Nagy as landmark trees. Mr. Nagy stated he submitted a tree survey to DPW. Mr. Koncsol stated Mr. Nagy was correct due to their findings when they went to the site.

Ingalls questioned what was decided regarding lights and bollards. Pastue referred to the site plan cover sheet. Ms. Hood responded the original photometric plan did not include the tall light poles and it was noted the taller light poles would look nicer. Discussion followed regarding the lighting.

Christiansen asked the proponent if he was opposed to using either type of lighting that had been discussed and Mr. Nagy noted either way would work.

Kuiken inquired about the curb cut approval from MDOT, and Mr. William Donnan, engineer, responded they have received a field review from MDOT and the proponent has addressed the few comments from MDOT. He noted the additional items couldn't be addressed until approval is received from the City. Mr. Donnan was addressing items the State had given him such as sewer, water tap permits; DEQ permit, which has been obtained; letter from the City that they will accept the water main and review of permit fees and bonding. The DEQ approval permit will be given to administration.

Christiansen verified the items that needed to be addressed to approve the site plan.

Gronbach questioned if more landscaping was needed to provide a buffer along the wetland area and parking area. Mr. Nagy responded they would work that out with administration.

Ms. Hood commented they could add some landscaping behind the detention basin and plant some trees along the back property line. She noted general replacement landscape ordinances ask that trees be replaced at a one to one caliper. She recommended 7 or 8 trees be planted at a 2 ½ inch caliper along the rear property line. Mr. Nagy responded they will bring a proposal per Ms. Hood's recommendations and they wanted to provide year round screening.

Gronbach reviewed the items that needed to be included in a motion to approve the Site Plan for the Soave Office Building.

Christiansen asked if there should be 1 or 2 motions regarding the site plan. Pastue stated it could be put in one motion and to mention the waiver of the front parking requirement.

MOTION by Christiansen, seconded by Pogue, to approve the Site Plan for Soave Professional Office Building, located at 32025 Grand River, with the following: the Planning Commission grant the waiver for the front yard setback, which is required to be zero lot line build-to in Section 7.03 with a 67.8 foot building setback as proposed; that the Planning Commission grant a waiver for parking in the front yard; the parking is required to be in the rear according to Section 14.01; it is proposed in the front yard on the site plan; that the petitioner obtain all required agency approvals, including and not limited to those for the floodplain fill from MDEQ and driveway access or curb cut from MDOT; and the lighting on the site consist of 3 bollards shown on the retaining wall with the one taller light pole on the south end of that extension, the 4<sup>th</sup> pole, the other pole across from that on the west and the one building light that is shown on the submitted plans that were reviewed this evening; that the petitioner submit a plan for additional landscaping as discussed this evening to City staff for review and acceptance by the City staff and that the approval is for the plans the Commissioners have in their packet for review this evening, April, 14, 2008.

Scott asked if there were any public comments from the audience. There were none.

Christiansen stated there was no public hearing required since this was a site plan approval by the Planning Commission. There was a public hearing for the variance review by the Board of Zoning Appeals and residents did attend that meeting.

Chairperson Gronbach asked for a vote on the motion: There were 7 ayes and 1 nay (Gronbach). Motion carried.

**CONSIDERATION TO APPROVE SITE PLAN FOR ADDITION FARMINGTON CROSSROADS SHOPPING CENTER, 22054 FARMINGTON ROAD**

Sherrin S. Hood, AICP Senior Planner, LSL Planning, Inc., presented the non-conforming review and stated as a non-conforming site, the Planning Commission shall determine the extent of required improvements based on the standards listed in Section 35-208 of the ordinance. She stated she had reviewed the minor changes requested noting the most significant revisions to the site are façade improvements proposed to all buildings on the site, and a small, 2,194 sq. ft. addition to the southern building.

Ms. Hood discussed the non-conforming issues of the site. She stated the Zoning Ordinance asks that where possible the existing non-conforming site be improved by way of landscaping, that the sign ordinance must be met and the proposed improvements to the site do not increase the existing non-conforming status of the site.

Ms. Hood commented the biggest non-forming issue is the parking in the front yard and the setbacks. She commented the driveway access is reasonable to the site and the driveway location is as far from the intersection as possible. She stated new developments in the City are not permitted to exceed the parking requirements by more

than 10% unless approved by the Planning Commission, but stated this is an existing condition and is allowed to remain.

She noted one of the primary issues was the landscaping. She noted the original landscape plan does not match the site plan and it does not reflect what is actually planted on the site. She discussed the current shrubs and trees on the site. Ms. Hood requested that the Planning Commission allow at least one canopy tree be planted in the parking lot islands and additional street trees be considered along both frontages. She noted new trees have been planted along Farmington Road and she felt the proponent had done their best to improve the landscaping along Farmington Road. She stated room for improvement was along Nine Mile Road and interior to the parking lot.

She stated the signs could be reviewed by administration.

Ms. Hood commented improvements to the existing building would include color changes to get away from the Farmer Jack's signature colors and to a beige type color and that most of the façade will remain as is. She noted the largest change would be the proposed canopy on the façade of both buildings. She noted the new addition at the end of the building is within an existing grass area with a different entryway.

Ms. Hood stated they are recommending approval of the proposed site plan for the Farmington Crossroads Shopping Center, with the following conditions:

1. Additional street trees and parking lot landscaping shall be added to the site, in an amount to be determined by the Planning Commission.
2. Details of the existing signage is needed to verify compliance with current regulations. The applicant may choose to revise their existing ground sign at the northwest corner of the site.
3. LSL suggests the applicant consider installing a knee wall and entrance signage similar to that which was installed on the TCF Bank site on the north side of Nine Mile Road.

John Hawkins, of Centro Properties Group, was present to answer questions from the Commission and to review their proposal. He proposed a 2200 sq. ft. addition with a constructed canopy enclosure instead of the metal canopy shown for the rest of the building. He questioned the signage requirements. Mr. Koncsol replied the pylon signs might be questioned, but currently signage is ok.

Christiansen noted he, Mr. Buck, and Mr. Scott met with the applicant at a work session along with Council and City Manager Pastue. He noted comments that had been made have been incorporated within the plan.

Sutton commented she liked the color scheme and reiterated what Ms. Hood said regarding the interior parking landscaping and encouraged the applicant to follow

through with it. Sutton noted the plantings at a Kroger store on Five Mile, between Middlebelt and Merriman.

Gronbach asked if outside seating needed to be addressed this evening. Mr. Koncsol replied he has met with the tenant and discussed materials for outside seating and advised them to not use vinyl or plastic seating or tables. He stated they were willing to comply.

In response to a question by Gronbach, Koncsol stated he had received the report from LSL Planning. Gronbach noted the issue of a knee wall similar to the TCF Bank. The applicant stated it was not in their budget, but he felt something could be worked into the pylon sign for a better face. Gronbach suggested landscaping be incorporated in the corner to make it a focal point. Mr. Hawkins replied they have not done a specific plan for landscaping, but entertain upgrading the landscaping to a point. Gronbach suggested the applicant refer with LSL Planning regarding a landscape plan. Ms. Hood recommended adding 1 tree in all of the parking islands. Mr. Hawkins stated he would update the plan.

Scott asked if the orange color would remain on south side of the building. Mr. Hawkins replied a change was not in the plan, but they will look at their budget to see if the color can be changed.

Discussion followed regarding signage.

Gronbach asked administration if a motion were made to approve, would it be appropriate to make the motion subject to a landscape plan being submitted that would be reviewed and approved by administration, with special emphasis on the corner pylon. Pastue replied he was comfortable with that.

MOTION by Christiansen, seconded by Scott, to approve the Site Plan for façade change plan for Farmington Crossroads Shopping Center, at the southeast corner of Farmington Road and Nine Mile Road, on the condition that the petitioner provide a landscape plan that would add additional trees to the site, preferably along the streets and in the parking landscape islands, and that plan be reviewed and approved by the administrative staff, that the petitioner provide information regarding the existing ground sign at the corner of Nine Mile Road and Farmington to assure it is in compliance with the current sign ordinance, and that the petitioner provide a plan to staff, modifying the existing ground sign, to match the character of the building, as indicated, and was desired by the petitioner, and also take into consideration with that modification the gateway characteristics of the adjacent knee wall, in this case to consider using some of the same masonry materials in order to be consistent with that character. Motion carried, all ayes.

In response to a question by Ingalls, Mr. Hawkins replied the block is a glazed ceramic. Ingalls voiced concern regarding painting and durability. Mr. Hawkins stated it is their home office and they want to make sure it is looking good.

Discussion followed regarding screening on the south side of the building.

### **DISCUSSION – FUTURE SPECIAL MEETING DATES**

- A. City Master Plan Update
- B. Joint Meeting with Farmington Hills Planning Commission

City Manager Pastue reviewed a letter received from Farmington Hills and Oakland County regarding Farmington Hills' Master Plan update. He noted the areas that would affect the City of Farmington. He stated they were looking for a greater intensity office building, research area to go along in the area near Halsted and M-5. He commented on the corridor improvements intended by Farmington Hills along Grand River. Pastue suggested LSL Planning, Inc. do a review of Farmington Hill's Master Plan, on behalf of the City and then schedule a time for the Planning Commission to review. He stated staff from both cities could meet to discuss the Grand River corridor and the industrial redevelopment area they are discussing.

Christiansen inquired if there were any proposed changes along the Orchard Lake corridor. Pastue replied there were significant changes and also along the Eight Mile and Haggerty corridor.

Pastue suggested using the website, fhgov.com, to review the Master Plan.

Buck voiced concern with the timing of the mailing of the Master Plan from Farmington Hills and requested there be an extension for the Planning Commission to review.

Pastue noted they comply with the statues and a public hearing has been scheduled.

Christiansen stated the State just went through a statutory change regarding the Planning Act pertaining to cities and villages and they have all been consolidated and Governor Granholm has signed the Michigan Planning and Enabling Act of 2008. He questioned the applicability of that new-signed law. He noted the time lines are all different and requirements for municipal notification to adjacent communities, is different. Buck commented the effective date is September 1<sup>st</sup>. Discussion followed regarding timelines and statute requirements dealing with notification from Farmington Hills regarding their Master Plan.

Pastue inquired if there was interest in having a special meeting to review the Master Plan. He noted the Planning Commission would be notified of a date for the special meeting.

Buck stated it is prudent to look at the Master Plan from Farmington Hills and send comments to them. He noted Farmington Hills will look closely at the Master Plan of the City of Farmington.

Discussion followed regarding review of the Master Plan on the website in order to make comments by the 13<sup>th</sup> and to see the implications for the City of Farmington. Pastue stated he would notify the Planning Director of Farmington Hills that comments regarding their Master Plan might be late.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Annette Knowles, DDA Director, reviewed the Streetscape Plan and she noted the Design Committee has been proceeding to complete the design drawings so they have a prepared set of construction drawings. She noted they are putting together a public information campaign to inform the residents about the project before the August 5<sup>th</sup> election. Discussion followed regarding time of completion if the proposal is approved.

### **COMMISSION COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Ingalls asked if the Walgreens Drug Store is cancelled. Pastue stated they are having issues with tenants and leases and they may be looking for a site plan extension.

Ingalls questioned the signage on the Hobby Shop. Koncsol replied it is within the requirements.

Gronbach inquired if the DDA tried to relocate some of the tenants at the Walgreens site. Pastue replied there has not been an effort at this point. Gronbach suggested the Economic Development Committee look at relocating businesses in order for Walgreens to proceed.

Buck stated he talked to the owner of the Hobby Shop and he was upset with the change.

Discussion followed regarding relocation of businesses.

Gronbach noted the rundown condition of the Worldwide Center. Koncsol stated they would be checking these areas.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION by Ingalls, seconded by Buck to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried, all ayes.

The meeting adjourned at 9:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Secretary